



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,646	09/29/2004	Anatoliy Panasyuk	2006579-0440 (CTX-087)	5645
69665 7590 06/16/2010 CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC. TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110			EXAMINER VOSTAL, ONDREJ C	
			ART UNIT 2453	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/16/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENTDOCKET@CHOATE.COM
jhess@choate.com
lbradley@choate.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/711,646	Applicant(s) PANASYUK ET AL.	
	Examiner O.C. Vostal	Art Unit 2453	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-18 and 20-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-18 and 20-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6, 8-18 and 20-26 presented for examination.
2. Claim 7 and 19 are canceled.
3. This action is in response to remarks and arguments filed on March 22, 2010, after non-final rejection of application 10/711646.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crump et al., US Patent 2002/ 0,078,208 A1, hereinafter Crump, in views of Verkama, US Patent Application Publication Number 2001/ 0,050,908 A1.
6. Regarding claim 1, Crump disclose a method for reconnecting a client to a host service (Crump; [0032]: The examiner considers "client connection is re-established" is similar to reconnecting a client to a host service.) the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2453

- (a) providing a first connection between a client and a first protocol service executing on a second computing device, and a second connection between the first protocol service and a host service executing on a third computing device (Crump; fig 4A);
- (b) detecting, by the first protocol service, a disruption in the first connection (Crump; [0032]: The examiner considers “detects a failure” is similar to detecting a disruption.);
- (c) re-establishing, by the client, the first connection between the client and the first protocol service while maintaining the second connection between the first protocol service and the host service (Crump; [0032], [0036] and [0039]: The examiner considers “client connection is re-established” is similar to re-establishing the first connection, and considers “active X.25 connections exist”... “as long as the X.25 network is operative” is similar to maintaining the second connection.);

Crump do not disclose receiving, validating and linking steps, but in a similar field of endeavor Verkama discloses:

- (d) receiving at the first protocol service a ticket associated with the client (Verkoma; [0013]: The examiner considers “an identifier is allocated to” is similar to receiving... a ticket, and considers “service connection” is similar to first protocol service.);
- (e) validating, by the first protocol service, the ticket (Verkoma; [0011] and [0012]: The examiner considers “storing an address or an identifier by

which the mobile station can be reached” is similar to validating... the ticket, and considers “should be identified everywhere” is similar to validating.); and

- (f) linking, by the first protocol service, after the ticket is validated, the re-established first connection to the maintained second connection (Verkama; [0012] and [0013]: The examiner considers “MAP protocol” is similar to first protocol service and considers “identifier of the service connection is transferred from the old SSP to the new SSP”, “by means of the transferred data, the service connection is established from the new SSP to the SCP” and “service connection would have to be re-established” are similar to linking... after the ticket is validated, the re-established first connection.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump's system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Verkama's system “equipment for providing network-initiated information transfer for terminals in a network” (Verkama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “able to communicate with the MS using the PDP

Art Unit: 2453

address indicated by the intelligent network node” (Verkama) and includes continuous connection to/thru network.

7. Regarding claim 2, Crump do not disclose claim 2, but in a similar field of endeavor Verkama discloses the method of claim 1 wherein step (a) further comprises authenticating the client with the host service during a first communication session between the client and the host service (Verkama; [0029]: The examiner considers “authenticating the MS subscriber” is similar to authenticating the client.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Verkama’s system “equipment for providing network-initiated information transfer for terminals in a network” (Verkama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “able to communicate with the MS using the PDP address indicated by the intelligent network node” (Verkama) and includes continuous connection to/thru network.

Art Unit: 2453

8. Regarding claim 13, Crump disclose a system for reconnecting a client to a host service (Crump; [0032]: The examiner considers “client connection is re-established” is similar to reconnecting a client to a host service.), the system comprising:

(a) a client configured to maintain a first connection with a first protocol service executing on a second computing device, the client re-establishing the first connection between the client and the first protocol server while maintaining the second connection between the first protocol server and the host service (Crump; fig 4A, [0032], [0036] and [0039]: The examiner considers “client connection is re-established” is similar to re-establishing the first connection, and considers “active X.25 connections exist”... “as long as the X.25 network is operative” is similar to maintaining the second connection.);

(b) the first protocol service configured to maintain the first connection with the client and a second connection with the host service executing on a third computing device, the first protocol service:

(ba) detecting a disruption in the first connection (Crump; [0032]: The examiner considers “detects a failure” is similar to detecting a disruption.),

Crump do not disclose receiving, validating and linking steps, but in a similar field of endeavor Verkama discloses:

- (bb) receiving a ticket transmitted by the client and associated with the client (Verkoma; [0004] and [0013]: The examiner considers “send/receive data packets to/from GPRS MS” is similar to transmitted by the client, considers “registering the new MSs” and “an identifier is allocated to” is similar to a ticket... associated with the client.);
- (bc) validating the ticket (Verkoma; [0011] and [0012]: The examiner considers “storing an address or an identifier by which the mobile station can be reached” is similar to validating... the ticket, and considers “should be identified everywhere” is similar to validating.); and
- (bd) after the ticket is validated, linking the re-established first connection to the maintained second connection (Verkoma; [0013]: The examiner considers “identifier of the service connection is transferred from the old SSP to the new SSP”, “by means of the transferred data, the service connection is established from the new SSP to the SCP” and “service connection would have to be re-established” are similar to linking, by the first protocol server, after the ticket is validated, the re-established first connection.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump's

Art Unit: 2453

system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Verkama’s system “equipment for providing network-initiated information transfer for terminals in a network” (Vekama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “able to communicate with the MS using the PDP address indicated by the intelligent network node” (Verkama) and includes continuous connection to/thru network..

9. Regarding claim 14, Crump do not disclose claim 14, but in a similar field of endeavor Verkama discloses the system of claim 13 wherein the client is authenticated with the host service during a first communication session between the client and the host service (Verkama; [0029]: The examiner considers “authenticating the MS subscriber” is similar to authenticating the client.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Verkama’s system “equipment for providing network-initiated information transfer for terminals in a network” (Vekama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “able to communicate with the MS using the PDP address indicated by the intelligent network node” (Verkama) and includes continuous connection to/thru network.

10. Claims 3-6, 8-1, 15-18 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crump et al., US Patent 2002/ 0,078,208 A1, hereinafter Crump, and in views of Verkama, US Patent Application Publication Number 2001/ 0,050,908 A1, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in views of Laursen et al., US Patent 6,065,120 (effective filing date is December 9, 1997), hereinafter Laursen.
11. Regarding claim 3, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 3, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the method of claim 1 wherein step (e) further comprises obtaining, from the ticket, a key and session id (Laursen; col 10 lines 63-67 and col 11 lines 1-10: The examiner considers “Upon receiving the SR from the client 170, the server 172 creates a server proto session for the client 170 with a session identifier, referred to as session ID. If server 172 is satisfied with the fact that the client is known, namely Encry[C-nonce, C-nonceModified] in the received SR are successfully decrypted with the shared secret encrypt key,

Art Unit: 2453

the step on in the client authentication is successful and a correspond session key is generated and stored". "SR" is similar to ticket.

"successfully decrypted with the shared secret encrypt key" is similar to obtaining a key.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump's and Verkama's system that provides the user "a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network" (Crump) with the features of Lauren's system "a generic solution for communicating desired ideas or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry" (Lauren).

The motivation being "an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections" (Crump) which includes "the user" who "is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary" (Lauren) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

12. Regarding claim 4, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 4, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the method of claim 3 wherein step (e) further comprises using the session id from the ticket to retrieve encrypted

Art Unit: 2453

authentication credentials (Laursen; col 10 lines 63-67 and col 11 lines 1-10:

The examiner considers "Upon receiving the SR from the client 170, the server 172 creates a server proto session for the client 170 with a session identifier, referred to as session ID. If server 172 is satisfied with the fact that the client is known, namely Encry[C-nonce, C-nonceModified] in the received SR are successfully decrypted with the shard secret encrypt key, the step one in the client authentication is successful and a correspond session key is generated and stored". "SR" is similar to ticket. "if server 172 is satisfied"... "are successfully decrypted"... "client authentication is successful" is similar to retrieve encrypted authentication credentials.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump's and Verkama's system that provides the user "a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network" (Crump) with the features of Lauren's system "a generic solution for communicating desired ideas or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry" (Verkama).

The motivation being "an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections" (Crump) which includes "the user" who "is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for

Art Unit: 2453

the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary” (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

13. Regarding claim 5, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 5, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the method of claim 4 wherein step (e) further comprises using the key from the ticket to decrypt the retrieved authentication credentials (Laursen; col 11 lines 5-15: The examiner considers “successfully decrypted with the shared secret encrypt key, the step one in the client authentication is successful”).).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Lauren’s system “a generic solution for communicating desired ideas or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry” (Verkama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “the user” who “is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for

Art Unit: 2453

the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary” (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

14. Regarding claim 6, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 6, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the method of claim 5 wherein step (e) further comprises re-authenticating the client with the host service using the decrypted authentication credentials (Laursen; col 11 lines 5-15 and lines 30-35: The examiner considers “successfully decrypted with the shard secret encrypt key, the step one in the client authentication is successful”. “If Encry[C-nonce, C-nonceModified] can not be successfully decrypted due to other reasons such as transmission errors, the client must reinitiate a new session request to the server in order to establish a secure communication with the server”. “Reinitiate”.. “to establish a secure” is similar to re-authenticate.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Lauren’s system “a generic solution for communicating desired ideas or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry” (Verkama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “the user” who “is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary” (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

15. Regarding claim 8, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 8, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the method of claim 1 wherein step (f) further comprises generating, after deleting the ticket, a replacement ticket (Laursen; col 12 lines 15-20: The examiner considers the client 170 discards the SP 176 and a new session creation may be started over again. “new session creation” is similar to generating a replacement.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Lauren’s system “a generic solution for communicating desired ideas or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry” (Verkama).

Art Unit: 2453

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “the user” who “is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary” (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

16. Regarding claim 9, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 9, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the method of claim 1 wherein step (a) further comprises generating a ticket at the first protocol service (Lauren; col 8 lines 20-26 and col 9 lines 55-65: The examiner considers “if supplied username and password match those is the account structure 143, the access requested by the PC 110 is allowed. access requested” is similar to receiving. “the authentication process is conducted with three message exchanges; a Session Request (SR)”... “Session Request” is similar to ticket. “The client 170”... “initiates a SR 174 to be sent to the server 174”. Also, “to be sent” is similar to generating.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Lauren’s system “a generic solution for communicating desired ideas

Art Unit: 2453

or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry” (Verkama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “the user” who “is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary” (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

17. Regarding claim 10, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 10, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the method of claim 9 wherein step (a) further comprises saving, at the first protocol service, a copy of the ticket (Laursen; col 11 lines 5-7: The examiner considers “The information in the received SR is saved in the server proto-session”. “Information in the received SR” is similar to copy of the ticket.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Lauren’s system “a generic solution for communicating desired ideas

or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry” (Verkama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “the user” who “is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary” (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

18. Regarding claim 11, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 11, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the method of claim 1 wherein step (a) further comprises transmitting the ticket from the first protocol service to the client (Laursen; col 11 lines 43-47: The examiner considers “Right after the successful step one client authentication, the server 172 responds to the client with a Session reply (SP) 176 to begin a second round authentication; server authentication”. “Responds to” is similar to transmitting the ticket from.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Lauren’s system “a generic solution for communicating desired ideas

or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry” (Verkama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “the user” who “is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary” (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

19. Regarding claim 15, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 15, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the system of claim 13 wherein the ticket comprises a key and session id (Laursen; col 10 lines 63-67: The examiner considers “Upon receiving the SR from the client 170, the server 172 creates a server proto session for the client 170 with a session identifier, referred to as session ID. If server 172 is satisfied with the fact that the client is known, namely $\text{Encry}[\text{C-nonce}, \text{C-nonceModified}]$ in the received SR are successfully decrypted with the shared secret encrypt key, the step on in the client authentication is successful and a correspond session key is generated and stored”. “SR” is similar to ticket. “successfully decrypted with the shared secret encrypt key” is similar to obtaining a key.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump's and Verkama's system that provides the user "a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network" (Crump) with the features of Lauren's system "a generic solution for communicating desired ideas or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry" (Verkama).

The motivation being "an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections" (Crump) which includes "the user" who "is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary" (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

20. Regarding claim 16, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 16, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the system of claim 15 wherein the ticket is validated by the first protocol service using the session id to retrieve encrypted authentication credentials (Laursen; col 10 lines 63-67: The examiner considers "Upon receiving the SR from the client 170, the server 172 creates a server proto session for the client 170 with a session identifier, referred to as session ID". "If server 172 is satisfied with the fact that the client is known, namely Encry[C-nonce, C-nonceModified] in the received SR are successfully

Art Unit: 2453

decrypted with the shard secret encrypt key, the step one in the client authentication is successful and a correspond session key is generated and stored". "SR" is similar to ticket. "if server 172 is satisfied"... "are successfully decrypted"... "client authentication is successful" is similar to retrieve encrypted authentication credentials.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump's and Verkama's system that provides the user "a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network" (Crump) with the features of Lauren's system "a generic solution for communicating desired ideas or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry" (Verkama).

The motivation being "an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections" (Crump) which includes "the user" who "is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary" (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

21. Regarding claim 17, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 17, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the system of claim 16 wherein the

Art Unit: 2453

ticket is further validated by decrypting the retrieved authentication credentials with the key from the ticket (Laursen; col 11 lines 5-15: The examiner considers “successfully decrypted with the shared secret encrypt key, the step one in the client authentication is successful”).).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Lauren’s system “a generic solution for communicating desired ideas or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry” (Verkama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “the user” who “is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary” (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

22. Regarding claim 18, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 18, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the system of claim 17 wherein the client is re-authenticated with the host service using the decrypted authentication

credentials (Laursen; col 11 lines 5-15 and lines 30-35: The examiner considers “successfully decrypted with the shard secret encrypt key, the step one in the client authentication is successful”. “If Encry[C-nonce, C-nonceModified] can not be successfully decrypted due to other reasons such as transmission errors, the client must reinitiate a new session request to the server in order to establish a secure communication with the server”. “Reinitiate”.. “to establish a secure” is similar to re-authenticate.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Lauren’s system “a generic solution for communicating desired ideas or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry” (Verkama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “the user” who “is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary” (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

Art Unit: 2453

23. Regarding claim 20, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 20, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the system of claim 13 wherein the first protocol service is further configured to generate, after deleting the ticket, a replacement ticket (Laursen; col 12 lines 15-20: The examiner considers the client 170 discards the SP 176 and a new session creation may be started over again. "new session creation" is similar to generating a replacement.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump's and Verkama's system that provides the user "a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network" (Crump) with the features of Lauren's system "a generic solution for communicating desired ideas or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry" (Verkama).

The motivation being "an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections" (Crump) which includes "the user" who "is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary" (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

Art Unit: 2453

24. Regarding claim 21, Crump and Verkama do not disclose, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the system of claim 13 wherein the first protocol service is further configured to generate the ticket (Lauren; col 8 lines 20-26 and col 9 lines 55-65: The examiner considers “if supplied username and password match those is the account structure 143, the access requested by the PC 110 is allowed”. “access requested” is similar to receiving. “the authentication process is conducted with three message exchanges; a Session Request (SR)”... “Session Request” is similar to ticket. “The client 170”... “initiates a SR 174 to be sent to the server 174”. Also, “to be sent” is similar to generating.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Lauren’s system “a generic solution for communicating desired ideas or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry” (Verkama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “the user” who “is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for

Art Unit: 2453

the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary” (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

25. Regarding claim 22, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 22, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the system of claim 12 wherein the first protocol service is further configured to save a copy of the ticket (Laursen; col 11 lines 5-7: The examiner considers “The information in the received SR is saved in the server proto-session”. “Information in the received SR is saved” is similar to copy of the ticket.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Lauren’s system “a generic solution for communicating desired ideas or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry” (Verkama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “the user” who “is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for

Art Unit: 2453

the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary” (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

26. Regarding claim 23, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 23, but in a similar field of endeavor Lauren disclose the system of claim 13 wherein the first protocol service is further configured to transmit the ticket to the client (Laursen; col 11 lines 43-47: The examiner considers “Right after the successful step one client authentication, the server 172 responds to the client with a Session reply (SP) 176 to begin a second round authentication; server authentication”. “Responds to” is similar to transmitting the ticket from.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Lauren’s system “a generic solution for communicating desired ideas or transactions from other devices with rich user interface to such a thin client through a self-provisioned account entry” (Verkama).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “the user” who “is the only one who knows the credential information created in an authenticated and secure communication session for

Art Unit: 2453

the rendezvous, thereby the account becomes truly proprietary” (Verkama) and includes securely storing interesting ideas, authentication info and credentials.

27. Claims 12 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crump et al., US Patent 2002/ 0,078,208 A1, hereinafter Crump, and in views of Verkama, US Patent Application Publication Number 2001/ 0,050,908 A1, as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in views of Yamanaka et al., US Patent 6,757,283 B1, hereinafter Yamanaka.
28. Regarding claim 12, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 12, but in a similar field of endeavor Yamanaka disclose the method of claim 1 wherein step (a) further comprises deleting the ticket automatically after a pre-determined period of time (Yamanaka; col 3 lines 40-53: The examiner considers “identifier” is similar to ticket, and considers “at a predetermined time” is similar to a pre-determined period of time.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the

Art Unit: 2453

features of Yamanaka's system "adds to a packet a content identifier for identifying the content" (Yamanaka).

The motivation being "an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections" (Crump) which includes "a push network capable of making effective use of the memory resources in each node" (Yamanaka) and includes cleaning unnecessary information.

29. Regarding claim 24, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 24, but in a similar field of endeavor Yamanaka disclose the system of claim 13 wherein the first protocol service is further configured to automatically delete the ticket after a pre-determined period of time (Yamanaka; col 3 lines 40-53: The examiner considers identifier is similar to ticket, and considers at a predetermined time is similar to a pre-determined period of time.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump's and Verkama's system that provides the user "a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network" (Crump) with the features of Yamanaka's system "adds to a packet a content identifier for identifying the content" (Yamanaka).

Art Unit: 2453

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “a push network capable of making effective use of the memory resources in each node” (Yamanaka) and includes cleaning unnecessary information.

30. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crump et al., US Patent 2002/ 0,078,208 A1, hereinafter Crump, and in views of Verkama, US Patent Application Publication Number 2001/ 0,050,908 A1, as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in views of Mirashrafi et al., US Patent Number 6,304,637 B1, hereinafter Mirashrafi.
31. Regarding claim 25, Crump and Verkama do not disclose claim 25, but in a similar field of endeavor Mirashrafi disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the third computing device is the second computing device (Mirashrafi; col 14 lines 57-67: The examiner considers “page Bridgeport” is similar to third computing device, and considers “changeover Bridgeport” is similar to a second computing device. “a member bridgeport actually can be a page bridgeport and a changover bridgeport at the same time for either same or different clients”).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for

Art Unit: 2453

recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the features of Mirashrafi’s system “apparatus for establishing and facilitating a direct quality voice call to a telephone handset on behalf of a client computer” (Mirashrafi).

The motivation being “an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections” (Crump) which includes “the ability of the network to successfully transmit information from one point in the network to another determines the quality of the network” (Mirashrafi) and includes reusing equipment at different locations.

32. Regarding claim 26, Crump and Verkama do not disclose, but in a similar field of endeavor Mirashrafi disclose the system of claim 13, wherein the third computing device is the second computing device (Mirashrafi; col 14 lines 57-67: The examiner considers “page Bridgeport” is similar to third computing device and considers “changeover Bridgeport” is similar to a second computing device. “a member bridgeport actually can be a page bridgeport and a changover bridgeport at the same time for either same or different clients”).).

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to readily recognize the advantage of modifying Crump’s and Verkama’s system that provides the user “a translating function for recovering multiple connections in a communications network” (Crump) with the

Art Unit: 2453

features of Mirashrafi's system "apparatus for establishing and facilitating a direct quality voice call to a telephone handset on behalf of a client computer" (Mirashrafi).

The motivation being "an efficient technique for recovering multiple connections" (Crump) which includes "the ability of the network to successfully transmit information from one point in the network to another determines the quality of the network" (Mirashrafi) and includes reusing equipment at different locations.

Response to Arguments

33. Applicant's arguments filed March 22, 2010, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
34. Applicant stated remarks demonstrate that the Examiner has twice stated that Crump does not disclose maintaining the second connection between the first protocol service and the host service. Therefore, the Examiner's contention is that Crump does teach or suggest "maintaining the second connection between the first protocol service and the host service", contradicts the Examiner's previous statements. In light of the Examiner's prior statements and in the interest of compact prosecution, Applicant's earnestly request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to this claim element.

Art Unit: 2453

Examiner's response is that after Examiner learned about X.25 protocol and details of Applicant's specification [0006], the claimed broadness has been clarified to the examiner. As stated in prior Office Action, Examiner's response is after reviewing X.25 protocol, a combination of Crump and Verkama do disclose linking after a ticket is validated, a re-established first connection to a maintained second connection between a first protocol service and a host service. For an explanation of validating, please refer to [0008] of the original specification. Specification [0008] states "session identifier from the ticket is used". For an explanation of temporary disruption in a network connection and maintaining second connection, please refer to [0006] of the original specification. Original specification discloses that temporary disruption occurs when roaming (transferring as disclosed by Verkama in an X.25 protocol area.) between different access points. Refer to 103 rejection above. Application original specification supports rejection. A X.25 protocol specification (about 1995 vintage) can be obtained, if necessary. Quick search revealed additional prior art (Ogier et al., US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/ 0,012,320) which also presents ([0321] and [0323]) two connections (one re-established and one maintained equivalent). The pending application claims do not overcome prior art, so the 103 rejection remains.

35. Applicant stated Verkama, like Crump, also does not teach or suggest re-establishing a first connection while maintaining a second connection between a

Art Unit: 2453

first protocol service and a host service. Rather, Verkama describes a system where information about a connection between an INSCP and MSC1 that acts like an INSSP, is transmitted to a new NSC2 when a user roams from an area of MSC1 to MSC2. See Verkama paragraphs 12-13. Upon receiving the connection information, “a service connection is established from” MSC2 to INSCP. Even if one were to characterize the connection between MSC2 and INSCP as the first connection, Verkama does not describe MSC2 and INSCP as having been first disconnected such that the connection needs to be reconnected. Furthermore, as stated previously, Verkama is entirely silent as to whether the connection between MSC1 and INSCP is maintained or disrupted. In light of the above remarks, Verkama and Crump fail to teach or suggest re-establishing a first connection while maintaining the second connection between the first protocol service and the host service. Verkama does not describe a disruption connection.

Examiner’s response is application specification [0006] states “a temporary disruption in a network connection may occur when a client, such as a mobile client, roams between different access points in the same network, or when a client switches between networks” and “When roaming between different access points”... the specification clearly states that roaming may create a temporary disruption in a network connection. So, specification makes “roams between different access points in the same network” includes disruption and re-establishing connection. The claim is satisfied.

Art Unit: 2453

36. Applicant stated Verkama and Crump fail to teach or suggest linking after a ticket is validated, the re-established first connection to the maintained second connection.

Examiner's response is Verkama ([0012] and [0013]) states "identifier of the service connection is transferred from the old SSP to the new SSP" and "by means of the transferred data, the service connection is established from the new SSP to the SCP" and "service connection would have to be re-established" are similar to linking... after the ticket is validated, the re-established first connection. Furthermore, Examiner's response is after reviewing X.25 protocol, a combination of Crump and Verkama do disclose linking after a ticket is validated, a re-established first connection to a maintained second connection between a first protocol service and a host service. For an explanation of validating, please refer to [0008] of the original specification. Specification [0008] states "validating method further includes obtaining a session identifier". For an explanation of temporary disruption in a network connection and maintaining second connection, please refer to [0006] of the original specification. Original specification discloses that temporary disruption occurs when roaming (transferring as disclosed by Verkama in an X.25 protocol area.) between different access points. Refer to 103 rejection above. Application original specification supports rejection. A X.25 protocol specification (about 1995 vintage) can be obtained, if necessary.

Conclusion

37. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

38. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to O. Charlie Vostal whose telephone number is 571-270-3992. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am to 5:00pm EST Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-4992.

Art Unit: 2453

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/O. C. Vostal/
Examiner
Art unit 2453
June 8, 2010

/Liangche A. Wang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2453